

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

JOSELITO FABIONAR, individuals, on  
behalf of themselves and all others similarly  
situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

FIRST FEDERAL BANK OF CALIFORNIA,  
as the Original Lender; SEASIDE  
FINANCIAL CORPORATION, as  
the Original Trustee; COMMONWEALTH  
LAND TITLE, Title Company; ONE WEST  
BANK, as Sub Servicer; AURORA LOAN  
SERVICES LLC, as the PSA Master  
Servicer; LEHMAN BROTHERS  
HOLDINGS INC. PSA Sponsor and Seller;  
STRUCTURED ASSET SECURITIES  
CORPORATION, as PSA Depositor;  
CITIBANK, N.A., as PSA Trustee;  
LASALLE BANK, N.A. U.S. BANK, N.A.  
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. PSA  
Custodian; LEHMAN XS TRUST, SERIES  
2005-3, as the PSA Trust Issuing Entity; TD  
SERVICE COMPANY, as the Foreclosing  
Trustee; and DOES 1 THROUGH 100,  
INCLUSIVE

Defendants.

Case No: C 12-0991 SBA

**ORDER DISMISSING ACTION**

On February 27, 2012, Plaintiff Joselito Fabionar ("Plaintiff"), proceeding pro se, brought the instant action against Defendants alleging various claims arising out of a home loan and the initiation of foreclosure proceedings. See Compl., Dkt. 1. On April 17, 2012, Defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. ("Wells Fargo") filed a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Dkt. 3. On May 7, 2012, Defendant

1 Aurora Loan Service, LLC ("Aurora") filed a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6). Dkt.  
2 13. Under Civil Local Rule 7-3, a party must file an opposition or statement of non-  
3 opposition to a motion no later than fourteen days (14) after the motion is filed. See N.D.  
4 Cal. Civ. L.R. 7-3(a), (b).<sup>1</sup> This Court's Standing Orders specifically warn that "failure of  
5 the opposing party to file a memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to any  
6 motion shall constitute a consent to the granting of the motion." Civil Standing Orders at 5,  
7 Dkt. 21. Plaintiff did not file a timely response to either of the motions to dismiss. Thus,  
8 on July 12, 2012, the Court sua sponte granted Plaintiff a 10-day extension of time to  
9 respond to the motions. Dkt. 26. The Court warned Plaintiff that if he failed to timely  
10 respond to the motions, the Court would dismiss this action under Rule 41(b) of the Federal  
11 Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to comply with a Court Order. Id. To date, Plaintiff  
12 has not filed anything in response to the motions or the Court's July 12, 2012 Order.

13 "Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), the district court may dismiss an  
14 action for failure to comply with any order of the court." Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d  
15 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992). As such, the failure to file an opposition to a motion to dismiss  
16 in the manner prescribed by the Court's Local Rules is a proper ground for dismissal.  
17 Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam). "In determining whether to  
18 dismiss a claim for failure to prosecute or failure to comply with a court order, the Court  
19 must weigh the following factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of  
20 litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to  
21 defendants/respondents; (4) the availability of less drastic alternatives; and (5) the public  
22 policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits." Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639,  
23 642 (9th Cir. 2002).

24 In the instant case, the Court finds that the above-referenced factors weigh in favor  
25 of dismissal. With regard to the first factor, "[t]he public's interest in expeditious resolution  
26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> The deadline to file an opposition is extended by 3 days if the motion was not filed  
28 and served through the Court's Electronic Case Filing ("ECF") system and was served  
pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5(b)(2)(C), (D), (E) or (F). Civ. L.R. 7-3(a).

1 of litigation always favors dismissal." Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 990 (9th  
2 Cir. 1999). This is particularly true in the instant case where Plaintiff has impeded the  
3 Court's ability to move this case forward by failing to respond to the motions to dismiss or  
4 to the Court's July 12, 2012 Order.

5 The second factor also militates in favor of dismissal. See Pagtalunan, 291 F.3d at  
6 642 ("It is incumbent upon the Court to manage its docket without being subject to routine  
7 noncompliance of litigants"); Yourish, 191 F.3d at 990 (recognizing court's need to control  
8 its own docket); see also Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1261 (non-compliance with a court's order  
9 diverts "valuable time that [the court] could have devoted to other major and serious  
10 criminal and civil cases on its docket").

11 The third factor, the risk of prejudice to the defendants, generally requires that "a  
12 defendant . . . establish that plaintiff's actions impaired defendant's ability to proceed to trial  
13 or threatened to interfere with the rightful decision of the case." Pagtalunan, 291 F.3d at  
14 642. At the same time, the Ninth Circuit has "related the risk of prejudice to the plaintiff's  
15 reason for defaulting." Id. Here, Plaintiff has offered no explanation for his failure to  
16 respond to the motions to dismiss, nor is any apparent from the record. Indeed, Plaintiff  
17 has had almost three months to prepare a response to Aurora's motion to dismiss and over  
18 three months to prepare a response to Well's Fargo's motion to dismiss. These facts weigh  
19 strongly in favor of dismissal. See Yourish, 191 F.3d at 991; Ghazali, 46 F.3d. at 54.

20 As to the fourth factor, the Court has already considered less drastic alternatives to  
21 dismissal. As noted, the Court's Standing Orders warn that as a consequence of a party's  
22 failure to oppose a motion, the Court will construe such inaction as a consent to the  
23 granting of the motion. In addition, the Court sua sponte afforded Plaintiff a second  
24 opportunity to oppose the motions to dismiss (or file statements of non-opposition) and  
25 warned him that the failure to respond to the motions would result in the dismissal of this  
26 action. "[A] district court's warning to a party that failure to obey the court's order will  
27 result in dismissal can satisfy the 'consideration of [less drastic sanctions]' requirement."  
28 Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1262.

1 The final factor, which favors disposition of cases on the merits, by definition,  
2 weighs against dismissal. Pagtalunan, 291 F.3d at 643 ("Public policy favors disposition of  
3 cases on the merits. Thus, this factor weighs against dismissal.").

4 In sum, the Court concludes that four of the five relevant factors weigh strongly in  
5 favor of dismissing this action in its entirety. Pagtalunan, 291 F.3d at 643 (affirming  
6 dismissal where three factors favored dismissal, while two factors weighed against  
7 dismissal).<sup>2</sup> Accordingly,

8 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the instant action is DISMISSED WITHOUT  
9 PREJUDICE pursuant to Rule 41(b). The Clerk shall close the file and terminate all  
10 pending matters.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED

12 Dated: 8/1/12

13 \_\_\_\_\_  
14 SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG  
15 United States District Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 <sup>2</sup> The rationale for dismissing this action applies equally to the remaining unserved  
27 defendants. See Abagninin v. AMVAC Chem. Corp., 545 F.3d 733, 742-743 (9th Cir.  
28 2008) ("As a legal matter, we have upheld dismissal with prejudice in favor of a party  
which had not appeared, on the basis of facts presented by other defendants which had  
appeared.").

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 FOR THE  
3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

4 JOSELITO FABIONAR,

5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 FIRST FEDERAL BANK OF CALIFORNIA et  
8 al,

9 Defendant.  
10 \_\_\_\_\_/

11  
12 Case Number: CV12-00991 SBA

13 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

14  
15 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District  
16 Court, Northern District of California.

17 That on August 14, 2012, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said  
18 copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing  
19 said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle  
20 located in the Clerk's office.

21 Joselito Fabionar  
22 27624 Baldwin Street  
23 Hayward, CA 94544

24 Dated: August 14, 2012

25 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk  
26 By: Lisa Clark, Deputy Clerk  
27  
28